

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 were pending in the application. Claims 16-45 have been withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention, but have not been canceled as rejoinder requested upon the allowance of claim 1. Claims 2, 5, and 10 have been cancelled and claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11-15, 18 and 21 have been amended. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found throughout the specification and claims as filed. Accordingly, once the amendments presented herein have been entered, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, and 11-15 will remain pending, and claims 16-45 will be withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

Rejection of claims 1-15 Under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite in the use of the term "A reagent". Applicants disagree, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended the preamble of the claim to be directed to "A tag molecule".

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3 and 6 over the use of the terms "isotope" and "isotope label." Applicants have amended the claims to consistently use the term "isotope label".

The Examiner has rejected to claim 1 because the arrangement of the different components in the tag molecule are unclear. Applicants traverse this rejection. Applicants set forth a molecule comprising 3 components that can be present in any of the possible arrangements. Applicants are entitled to claim their invention as broadly as possible. The instant claim is clear and definite.

Claim 2 has been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection of claim 2 moot.

Claim 3 has been amended, thereby rendering the rejection of claim 3 moot.

Claim 5 has been amended to better define the subject matter that is being claimed.

The Examiner has rejected claim 14 over the use of the term "modified residue". Applicants traverse this rejection. The term is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art and example of modified residues are presented in the specification and in claim 15.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing Applicants believe that the rejections of the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph have been overcome. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the foregoing rejections.

Rejection of claims 1, 6-9, 11 and 14 Under 35 USC 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6-9, 11, and 14 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Aebersold et al. Aebersold et al. teach reagents for mass spectrometric analysis of proteins having the formula A-L-PRG, wherein A is an affinity tag, L is a linker and PRG is a protein reactive group. However, the claim as amended are directed to tag molecules comprising, among other features, a disulfide bond covalently anchoring the tag molecule to a solid phase. Aebersold et al. do not teach or suggest the use of a disulfide linker to attach the tag to a solid support. Accordingly, the claims are novel and inventive over the teachings of Aebersold et al. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the foregoing rejection.

Rejection of claims 1, 6-9, 11 and 14 Under 35 USC 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6-9, 11, and 14 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sundrehagen et al. Sundrehagen et al. do not teach or suggest the use of a disulfide linker to attach the tag to a solid support. Accordingly, the claims are novel and inventive over the teachings of Sundrehagen et al. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the foregoing rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan M. Sparks, Ph.D.

Registration No.: 53,624

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Massachusetts 02205

(617) 439-4444

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant